

Cubic polynomials on Lie groups: reduction of the Hamiltonian system

L Abrunheiro¹, M Camarinha² and J Clemente-Gallardo³

¹ ISCA - Universidade de Aveiro, Rua Associação Humanitária dos Bombeiros de Aveiro, 3811-902 Aveiro–Portugal

² Departamento de Matemática, Universidade de Coimbra, 3001-454 Coimbra–Portugal

³ BIFI-Departamento de Física Teórica, Universidad de Zaragoza, Edificio I+D, Campus Río Ebro, C/ Mariano Esquillor s/n, E-50018 Zaragoza–Spain

E-mail: abrunheirologia@ua.pt, mmlsc@mat.uc.pt,
jesus.clementegallardo@bifi.es

Abstract. This paper analyzes the problem of cubic polynomials on compact Lie groups from a Hamiltonian point of view: the description and the reduction. The dynamics of the problem is described by a presymplectic formalism associated with the canonical symplectic form on the cotangent bundle of the semidirect product of the Lie group and its Lie algebra. Using these control geometrical tools, the relation between the Hamiltonian approach developed here and the known variational one is analyzed. After the concretization of the left trivialized system, we use the technique of Marsden-Weinstein reduction to remove the symmetries of the Hamiltonian system. In view of the reduced dynamics, we are able to guarantee, by means of the Lie-Cartan theorem, the existence of a considerable number of independent integrals of motion in involution.

AMS classification scheme numbers: 34A26, 34H05, 49J15, 53B20, 53D20, 70H33, 70H50

1. Introduction

Riemannian cubic polynomials (RCP), also called Riemannian cubics, can be seen as a generalization of cubic polynomials in Euclidean spaces to Riemannian manifolds. The cubic polynomials on a Riemannian manifold are the smooth solutions of the fourth order differential equation

$$\frac{D^4x}{dt^4} + R \left(\frac{D^2x}{dt^2}, \frac{Dx}{dt} \right) \frac{Dx}{dt} = 0, \quad (1)$$

where D/dt denotes the covariant differentiation and R the curvature tensor. The equation (1) is the Euler-Lagrange equation of a second order variational problem with Lagrangian given by $\frac{1}{2} \langle D^2x/dt^2, D^2x/dt^2 \rangle$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the Riemannian metric. This variational problem was first introduced in 1989 (see [25]) and explored from a dynamical interpolation perspective in 1995 (see [15]). Interesting points related to this subject have been developed in the last few years, namely a geometric theory surprisingly close to the Riemannian theory of geodesics (see [2, 3, 4, 10, 12, 13, 14, 17, 26, 27, 29, 30]). We recall, in particular, a result which says that if V denotes the velocity vector field of a cubic polynomial x , then

$$I_1 = \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \frac{DV}{dt}, \frac{DV}{dt} \right\rangle - \left\langle \frac{D^2V}{dt^2}, V \right\rangle \quad (2)$$

is invariant along x . In Riemannian context, I_1 plays a role similar to the one played by the length of the velocity vector field in the theory of geodesics (see, for example [14]). Recently, in [3, 26, 27, 29], the analysis of RCP from a variational point of view was carried out for locally symmetric manifolds and a second invariant was obtained:

$$I_2 = \left\langle \frac{D^2V}{dt^2}, \frac{D^2V}{dt^2} \right\rangle - \left\langle \frac{D^3V}{dt^3}, \frac{DV}{dt} \right\rangle. \quad (3)$$

The analysis of RCP given in [3, 26] is qualitative, with special attention to the case of the Lie group $SO(3)$, where RCP correspond to Lie quadratics on the Lie algebra. The article [3] introduces a reduction of the RCP's equation for this Lie group of rotations. In [26] some results on asymptotics and symmetries of cubics are proved for the particular case of the so-called null cubics on $SO(3)$. In [27], the author solves by quadratures the linking equation on $SO(3)$ and $SO(1, 2)$ of the Riemannian cubics. Finally, [29] studies n -th order generalizations of RCP introduced in [12].

To our knowledge, the first Hamiltonian description of the RCP problem has been considered in [13] (made in collaboration with one of the authors). The present paper deals, for the case of arbitrary compact and connected Lie groups, with a different Hamiltonian description of the problem. Here we use a presymplectic approach to the Pontryagin's Maximum Principle inspired by some ideas of [7, 9, 16, 22]. Namely, we consider the intrinsic geometric approach used in [16, 22] for a first order general optimal control problem, and similarly considered in [7] for time-dependent optimal control problems by using the jet bundles framework. In a similar way, [9] gives the geometric treatment of the Lagrangian dynamics with higher-order constraints. The

description of RCP (on an arbitrary manifold) using these geometric ideas were first presented in [4] by the authors of the present paper. Recently, in [5], the authors have treated the particular situation of the dynamic control of the spherical free rigid body, a mechanical system with configuration manifold given by the Lie group $SO(3)$. The new contribution of this presymplectic formalism is to use the Lie group structure of the semidirect product of the Lie group and its Lie algebra, $G \times \mathfrak{g}$, which is the state space of the optimal control problem. This allows us to use classical results from [1, 8], adapted to this Lie group structure. Namely, we present the left trivialization of the Hamiltonian system, a set of equations which lives in the manifold given by the cartesian product of the semidirect product above mentioned and the dual of its Lie algebra, $G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*$.

The main goal of this work is to reduce the degrees of freedom of the left trivialized Hamiltonian system. We first apply the symplectic point reduction theorem ([23, 28]) and then explore the reduced dynamics using a suitable symplectomorphism. The reduced Hamiltonian vector field lives in the manifold given by the cartesian product of a coadjoint orbit, the Lie algebra and its dual, $\mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$. Furthermore, some invariants along the extremal trajectories are characterized as a crucial point to develop, in a future work, a study of the integrability of the Hamiltonian system. In fact, using the Lie-Cartan theorem ([6]), we obtain an interesting result on the number of independent integrals of motion in involution.

The plan of the paper is as follows. Section 2 is a support of the other sections and it reports some notes on compact Lie groups and fixes the notation. Section 3 begins with the introduction of the optimal control problem of cubic polynomials and presents the corresponding presymplectic approach. After that, we provide the left trivialized description equivalent to the variational one ([15]) in a similar way to what happens in [13]. However, it is important to remark that our Hamiltonian system and the one in [13] are different. The last section contains the reduction of the Hamiltonian problem by means of the Marsden-Weinstein technique. As we have mentioned above, the system will be reduced to a system on the cartesian product of a coadjoint orbit, the algebra of the Lie group and the dual of this algebra. In this context, besides the geometric deduction of the two known invariants, we find some more invariants along the Riemannian cubics and find a relevant result on its independence and involution.

2. Preliminary notes

The present section gives some notations, definitions and results from the Lie groups theory, which we will be using throughout the paper.

2.1. The Lie group G

Let G be a connected and compact Lie group with identity e . The corresponding Lie algebra is $(\mathfrak{g}, [., .])$, where $[., .]$ is the bracket operation and $\mathfrak{g}^*$ denotes the dual space

of this algebra. Furthermore, the elements of G are denoted by x or g and the maps $G \times G \rightarrow G, (x, g) \mapsto xg$ and $G \rightarrow G, x \mapsto x^{-1}$ are the multiplication and inversion operations for the Lie group G , respectively. Given $x, g \in G$, let $L_x : G \rightarrow G$ and $R_x : G \rightarrow G$ be, respectively, the left and right translations by x . The tangent of L_x at g is denoted by $T_g L_x$ and $T_g^* L_x$ represents its transpose. Recall the following definitions:

- The adjoint representation of the Lie group G is denoted by Ad . It gives for each $x \in G$ an algebra automorphism defined by $\text{Ad}_x = T_e(R_{x^{-1}} \circ L_x)$.
- The adjoint representation of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is the tangent of Ad at the identity e and it is denoted by ad . For each $Y, Z \in \mathfrak{g}$, we have $\text{ad}_Y Z = [Y, Z]$.
- The map $\text{Ad}^* : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ defined, by $[\text{Ad}^*(x)](\xi) := \text{Ad}_{x^{-1}}^* \xi = \xi \circ \text{Ad}_{x^{-1}}$, for each $x \in G$ and $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, is called the co-adjoint representation of G .
- The co-adjoint representation of $\mathfrak{g}$ is the map $\text{ad}^* : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ defined, for each $Y \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, by $[\text{ad}^*(Y)](\xi) := -\text{ad}_Y^* \xi = -\xi \circ \text{ad}_Y$.

Since the Lie group is assumed to be connected and compact, we can guarantee the existence of a bi-invariant metric on G , which we shall denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. This statement and the following result can be found for instance in [24].

Theorem 1 [24] *If G is a Lie group equipped with a bi-invariant metric, the metric connection ∇ and the curvature tensor R associated with that metric are given, respectively, by $\nabla_Y Z = \frac{1}{2}[Y, Z]$ and $R(Y, Z)W = -\frac{1}{4}[[Y, Z], W]$, where Y, Z and W are left invariant vector fields. Furthermore, the first above equality implies that $\langle [Y, Z], W \rangle = \langle Y, [Z, W] \rangle$.*

In the course of this paper, we shall fix an orthonormal basis in the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. The corresponding dual basis is a basis of the dual space $\mathfrak{g}^*$. These two bases generate left invariant frame and co-frame fields on G , respectively. We assume the following notations:

- Let Y be a curve in $\mathfrak{g}$ and ξ a curve in $\mathfrak{g}^*$. We represent by $\dot{Y}$ (respectively, $\dot{\xi}$) the element of $\mathfrak{g}$ (respectively, $\mathfrak{g}^*$) which has components with respect to the left-invariant frame (respectively, co-frame) field above mentioned, given by the derivative of the components of Y (respectively, ξ).
- Given $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, the tangent vector identified with this co-vector by the Riemannian metric will be denoted by $X_\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$. That is, $\xi(Y) = \langle X_\xi, Y \rangle, \forall Y \in \mathfrak{g}$.
- With the above notation, it is simple to verify that $\dot{X}_\xi = X_{\dot{\xi}}$ and $X_{\text{ad}_Y^* \xi} = -\text{ad}_Y X_\xi$.

2.2. The tangent bundle Lie group and its left trivialization

Lemma 1 [21] *The tangent bundle TG is a Lie group with a group operation defined as the tangent prolongation of the original one on G . That is, the multiplication operation for TG is defined by*

$$(v_x, v_g) \in T_x G \times T_g G \mapsto v_x v_g = T_x R_g v_x + T_g L_x v_g \in T_{xg} G$$

and the inversion is defined by

$$v_x \in T_x G \mapsto v_x^{-1} = -(T_e L_{x^{-1}} \circ T_x R_{x^{-1}})(v_x) \in T_{x^{-1}} G.$$

Consider the semidirect product $G \ltimes \mathfrak{g}$ of the Lie group G and the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ regarded as abelian group, under the right action of G on $\mathfrak{g}$, $(x, Y) \in G \times \mathfrak{g} \mapsto \text{Ad}_{x^{-1}} Y$.

Lemma 2 *The semidirect product $G \ltimes \mathfrak{g}$ is a Lie group whose underlying manifold is the cartesian product $G \times \mathfrak{g}$ and group multiplication law*

$$(x, Y)(g, Z) = (xg, \text{Ad}_{g^{-1}} Y + Z),$$

for $(x, Y), (g, Z) \in G \times \mathfrak{g}$. The inversion is defined as $(x, Y)^{-1} = (x^{-1}, -\text{Ad}_x Y)$.

In order to simplify the notation, we shall denote the semidirect product by $G \ltimes \mathfrak{g}$ instead of $G \ltimes \mathfrak{g}$.

The semidirect product structure considered here is a special case of the general one defined by a right representation of a Lie group on a vector space that may be found in works on semidirect products, particularly the ones on models of continuum mechanics and plasmas where it is convenient to work with right instead of left representations (see, for example [20]).

Proposition 1 [21] *The left trivialization of TG determined by the map*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda : TG &\longrightarrow G \times \mathfrak{g} \\ v_x \in T_x G &\longmapsto (x, T_x L_{x^{-1}} v_x), \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

allows us to write the Lie group diffeomorphism $TG \simeq G \ltimes \mathfrak{g}$.

We introduce now some important notations used in the rest of the paper.

- The elements of the tangent bundle $T(G \ltimes \mathfrak{g})$ are denoted by

$$(v_x, Y, U) \in T_{(x, Y)}(G \ltimes \mathfrak{g}) = T_x G \times \{Y\} \times \mathfrak{g}.$$

- The second tangent bundle of G , $T^2 G$, can also be trivialized by using the map λ and then realized as a vector bundle over $G \ltimes \mathfrak{g}$, which is a vector subbundle of $T(G \ltimes \mathfrak{g})$. We represent this bundle by $\overline{T^2} G$ and denote its elements as

$$(v_x, U) \in T_{(x, T_x L_{x^{-1}} v_x)}(G \ltimes \mathfrak{g}) \simeq T_x G \times \mathfrak{g}.$$

- The elements of cotangent bundle $T^*(G \ltimes \mathfrak{g})$ are represented by

$$(\alpha_x, Y, \xi) \in T_{(x, Y)}^*(G \ltimes \mathfrak{g}) = T_x^* G \times \{Y\} \times \mathfrak{g}^*.$$

In the previous statements we are considering $(x, Y) \in G \times \mathfrak{g}$. Throughout this paper we will, for the sake of simplicity, occasionally assume the identification between elements of $T_{(x,Y)}(G \times \mathfrak{g})$ (respectively, $T_{(x,Y)}^*(G \times \mathfrak{g})$) and elements of $T_x G \times \mathfrak{g}$ (respectively, $T_x^* G \times \mathfrak{g}^*$).

According the Lie group structure chosen in lemma 2, we easily compute:

$$T_{(e,0)}L_{(x,Y)}(Z, U) = (T_e L_x Z, U + \text{ad}_Y Z) \quad (5)$$

and

$$\text{ad}_{(Y,Z)}(Y', Z') = (\text{ad}_Y Y', \text{ad}_Y Z' + \text{ad}_Z Y'), \quad (6)$$

where $x \in G$ and $Y, Z, U, Y', Z' \in \mathfrak{g}$. Obviously, these formulas can be derived from the general known ones from the theory of semidirect products.

3. Hamiltonian system

The aim of this section is to give a Hamiltonian description of the optimal control problem of cubic polynomials on G based on some material published in [4], where we used a geometric formulation similar to the one developed in [9] for higher order constrained variational problems. The section begins with the introduction of the optimal control problem, where by means of the left translation on G , the state space has been left trivialized to be $G \times \mathfrak{g}$ instead of TG . After that, we apply a presymplectic constraint algorithm and the result is a Hamiltonian system on a space symplectomorphic to $T^*(G \times \mathfrak{g})$. Using again a left trivialization, but now determined by left translation on the group $G \times \mathfrak{g}$, we pass to a Hamiltonian description on $G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*$.

3.1. Optimal control problem

Considering the left trivialization (4) of TG , the state space for our problem may be taken to be the semidirect product $G \times \mathfrak{g}$ and the bundle of controls as the second tangent bundle $\overline{T^2}G$. The optimal control problem of cubic polynomials on G consists in finding the C^2 piecewise smooth curve $\gamma : [0, T] \rightarrow \overline{T^2}G$ with fixed endpoints in state space, minimizing the functional $\int_0^T L(\gamma(t))dt$, with $T \in \mathbb{R}^+$ fixed, for $L : \overline{T^2}G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the cost functional defined by

$$L(v_x, U) = \frac{1}{2} \langle U, U \rangle \quad (7)$$

and satisfying the control system

$$\frac{d}{dt} (\tau_2^1(\gamma(t))) = F(\gamma(t)), \quad (8)$$

where $\tau_2^1 : \overline{T^2}G \rightarrow G \times \mathfrak{g}$ is the natural projection and $F : \overline{T^2}G \rightarrow T(G \times \mathfrak{g})$ is the vector field along this projection defined by

$$F(v_x, U) = (v_x, T_x L_{x^{-1}} v_x, U). \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& \overline{T^2}G & \xrightarrow{F} T(G \times \mathfrak{g}) \\
\tau_2^1 \swarrow & \uparrow \gamma & \nearrow \frac{d}{dt}(\tau_2^1 \circ \gamma) \\
G \times \mathfrak{g} & \xleftarrow{\tau_2^1 \circ \gamma} [0, T] &
\end{array}$$

Notice that, according to the notation set in the subsection 2.2, a curve γ in $\overline{T^2}G$ is defined by means of three elements: a curve x in G ; a vector field Y_x along x (which can be seen as a curve in TG satisfying $\pi_G \circ Y_x = x$, where $\pi_G : TG \rightarrow G$ is the canonical projection); and a curve U in $\mathfrak{g}$. So, $\gamma(t) = (Y_x(t), U(t)) \in T_{x(t)}G \times \mathfrak{g}$ and we have $\tau_2^1(\gamma(t)) = (x(t), T_{x(t)}L_{x(t)}Y_x(t))$. Consequently, using the appropriated basis of left invariant vector field on G to develop the calculus, it is simply to prove that the control system (8) can be written as

$$\dot{x}(t) = Y_x(t) \quad \frac{DY_x}{dt}(t) = T_e L_{x(t)}U(t), \quad (10)$$

which is a version of the control system presented in papers [11, 13].

3.2. Dynamics of the optimal control problem

The co-state space of our system is the cotangent bundle $T^*(G \times \mathfrak{g})$. The dynamics of the control problem is described by a presymplectic system $(\mathcal{T}, \overline{\Omega}, \overline{H})$ whose total space is the vector bundle over $G \times \mathfrak{g}$ given by

$$\mathcal{T} = T^*(G \times \mathfrak{g}) \times_{G \times \mathfrak{g}} \overline{T^2}G. \quad (11)$$

The elements of this space are points in $T_x^*G \times \{Y\} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}$ denoted by (α_x, Y, ξ, U) , where $(x, Y) \in G \times \mathfrak{g}$. Consider the canonical projections $pr_1 : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow T^*(G \times \mathfrak{g})$, $(\alpha_x, Y, \xi, U) \mapsto (\alpha_x, Y, \xi)$ and $pr_2 : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \overline{T^2}G$, $(\alpha_x, Y, \xi, U) \mapsto (T_e L_x Y, U)$. The closed two form is defined by the pull-back

$$\overline{\Omega} = (pr_1)^* \Omega_1, \quad (12)$$

with Ω_1 denoting the canonical symplectic two form on the space $T^*(G \times \mathfrak{g})$. The Hamiltonian is defined by $\overline{H} = \ll pr_1, F \circ pr_2 \gg - L \circ pr_2$, where F and L are defined by (7) and (9) and $\ll \cdot, \cdot \gg$ stands for the canonical duality product of vectors and covectors on $G \times \mathfrak{g}$. Then,

$$\overline{H}(\alpha_x, Y, \xi, U) = (T_e^* L_x \alpha_x)(Y) + \xi(U) - \frac{1}{2} \langle U, U \rangle. \quad (13)$$

The dynamical vector field of the system is the vector field $X_{\overline{H}} : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow T\mathcal{T}$ solution of the dynamical system $i_{X_{\overline{H}}} \overline{\Omega} = d\overline{H}$.

Notice that the optimal control problem is obviously regular and thus applying the geometric algorithm of presymplectic systems (see [18, 19]) to $(\mathcal{T}, \overline{\Omega}, \overline{H})$, we obtain a symplectic system on the manifold $W_1 = \{(\alpha_x, Y, \xi, U) \in \mathcal{T} : U = X_\xi\}$, where $X_\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$ is the tangent vector identified with the covector $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ by the Riemannian metric

of G . Hence, $(W_1, \overline{H}_{W_1}, \overline{\Omega}_{W_1})$ is a symplectic system, with $\overline{\Omega}_{W_1}$ and $\overline{H}_{W_1}$ being the restrictions to W_1 of (12) and (13), respectively. The map f defined below, gives us a diffeomorphism between the symplectic manifolds $(T^*(G \times \mathfrak{g}), \Omega_1)$ and $(W_1, \overline{\Omega}_{W_1})$

$$\begin{aligned} f : (T^*(G \times \mathfrak{g}), \Omega_1) &\longrightarrow (W_1, \overline{\Omega}_{W_1}) \\ (\alpha_x, Y, \xi) &\longmapsto (\alpha_x, Y, \xi, X_\xi). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

So, we have a symplectomorphism between the two manifolds (see [1], p 177). In this sense, we construct the Hamiltonian $H_1 := \overline{H}_{W_1} \circ f : T^*(G \times \mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We get

$$H_1(\alpha_x, Y, \xi) = (T_e^* L_x \alpha_x)(Y) + \frac{1}{2} \xi(X_\xi), \quad (15)$$

for each $(\alpha_x, Y, \xi) \in T_{(x,Y)}^*(G \times \mathfrak{g})$, where $(x, Y) \in G \times \mathfrak{g}$. Furthermore, the existence of the symplectomorphism (14) allows us to conclude that (see [1], p 194) the study of the dynamical system defining the Hamiltonian vector field $X_{\overline{H}_{W_1}}$ associated to $\overline{H}_{W_1}$ is reduced to the study of the system

$$i_{X_{H_1}} \Omega_1 = dH_1, \quad (16)$$

where the vector field $X_{H_1} : T^*(G \times \mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow T(T^*(G \times \mathfrak{g}))$ is the push-forward of $X_{\overline{H}_{W_1}}$ by f^{-1} , $X_{H_1} = (f^{-1})_* X_{\overline{H}_{W_1}}$. The integral curves of this vector field determine, when lifted back to the original manifold, the solutions of the optimal control problem (see [16, 7]).

3.3. Left trivialization of the dynamics

Consider now the left trivialization of the cotangent bundle $T^*(G \times \mathfrak{g})$, determined by the diffeomorphism ρ defined from $T^*(G \times \mathfrak{g})$ to the space $G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ as

$$\rho(\alpha_x, Y, \xi) = (x, Y, T_{(e,0)}^* L_{(x,Y)}(\alpha_x, Y, \xi)),$$

which using (5) gives $\rho(\alpha_x, Y, \xi) = (x, Y, T_e^* L_x \alpha_x + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi, \xi)$, for each (α_x, Y, ξ) in $T_{(x,Y)}^*(G \times \mathfrak{g})$, where $(x, Y) \in G \times \mathfrak{g}$. Observe that, if $(x, Y, \mu, \xi) \in G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*$, then $\rho^{-1}(x, Y, \mu, \xi) = (T_x^* L_{x^{-1}}(\mu - \text{ad}_Y^* \xi), Y, \xi) \in T_{(x,Y)}^*(G \times \mathfrak{g})$.

The left trivialization of the Hamiltonian (15) is given by $H := H_1 \circ \rho^{-1}$. We easily conclude that

$$H(x, Y, \mu, \xi) = \mu(Y) + \frac{1}{2} \xi(X_\xi). \quad (17)$$

Since ρ is a diffeomorphism, we can endow (see [1], p 177) $G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ with a symplectic structure, as $\Omega = (\rho^{-1})^* \Omega_1$. Furthermore, ρ is a symplectomorphism and (see [1], p 194) the Hamiltonian vector field X_{H_1} defined by (16) may be left trivialized to $G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ by considering the push-forward by ρ of the Hamiltonian vector field associated to H_1 , $X_H := \rho_* X_{H_1}$.

The proposition below leads us to the expression of X_H :

$$X_H(x, Y, \mu, \xi) = (T_e L_x Y, X_\xi, 0, -\mu + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi), \quad (18)$$

for each $(x, Y, \mu, \xi) \in G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*$.

Proposition 2 *The following set of differential equations describe the motions of the Hamiltonian system $(G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*, \Omega, H)$*

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = T_e L_x Y \\ \dot{Y} = X_\xi \\ \dot{\mu} = 0 \\ \dot{\xi} = -\mu + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi. \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

PROOF. Let $z = (x, Y, \mu, \xi)$ be an integral curve of X_H . Following ([8], section A.3, example 3) the Hamiltonian's equations on the cotangent bundle of the Lie group $G \times \mathfrak{g}$ are

$$\begin{cases} (\dot{x}, \dot{Y}) = T_{(e,0)} L_{(x,Y)} \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial \mu}(z), \frac{\partial H}{\partial \xi}(z) \right) \\ (\dot{\mu}, \dot{\xi}) = -T_{(e,0)}^* L_{(x,Y)} \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial x}(z), \frac{\partial H}{\partial Y}(z) \right) + \text{ad}_{\left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial \mu}(z), \frac{\partial H}{\partial \xi}(z)\right)}^* (\mu, \xi). \end{cases}$$

In this notation, $\partial H(z)/\partial x$ is regarded as an element of $T_x^* G$, $\partial H(z)/\partial Y$ as an element of $\mathfrak{g}^*$, $\partial H(z)/\partial \mu$ and $\partial H(z)/\partial \xi$ as elements of $\mathfrak{g}$. Use (5) and (2.2) to rewrite the previous system as

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = T_e L_x \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mu}(z) \\ \dot{Y} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial \xi}(z) + \text{ad}_Y \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mu}(z) \\ \dot{\mu} = -T_e^* L_x \frac{\partial H}{\partial x}(z) - \text{ad}_Y^* \frac{\partial H}{\partial Y}(z) + \text{ad}_{\frac{\partial H}{\partial \mu}(z)}^* \mu + \text{ad}_{\frac{\partial H}{\partial \xi}(z)}^* \xi \\ \dot{\xi} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial Y}(z) + \text{ad}_{\frac{\partial H}{\partial \mu}(z)}^* \xi. \end{cases}$$

From the expression of the Hamiltonian function (17) it comes $\partial H(z)/\partial x = 0$, $\partial H(z)/\partial Y = \mu$, $\partial H(z)/\partial \mu = Y$ and $\partial H(z)/\partial \xi = X_\xi$. Now, substitute these expressions in the above system, use the fact that $\text{ad}_{X_\xi}^* \xi = 0$ and the result follows. $\square$

Remark 1 *It will now be interesting to see how the dynamics described by (18) is related with the known variational approach of cubic polynomials. To proceed, we begin with the following remarks:*

- *First write the last equation of (19) as an equation on the Lie algebra, using the identification of covectors and tangent vectors giving by the Riemannian metric of G (see the end of subsection 2.1 for details on notation). We get $\dot{X}_\xi = -X_\mu - \text{ad}_Y X_\xi$.*
- *Differentiate the above equation and use the third equation of (19), to obtain $\ddot{X}_\xi + \text{ad}_{\dot{Y}} X_\xi + \text{ad}_Y \dot{X}_\xi = 0$. Use the second equation of (19), to get $\ddot{Y} + [Y, \ddot{Y}] = 0$.*

We have just shown that each solution of the equations of Hamilton (19) gives rise to a solution of the equations

$$Y = T_x L_{x^{-1}} \dot{x} \quad \ddot{Y} + [Y, \ddot{Y}] = 0. \quad (20)$$

Conversely, solutions of (20) satisfying $\dot{Y} = X_\xi$ and $\dot{X}_\xi + X_\mu + \text{ad}_Y X_\xi = 0$, correspond to solutions of (19).

The equations (20) are the Euler-Lagrange equations (1) that define the cubic polynomials on a Lie group, which were proved in [15] as an extension of the proof that had already been given in [25] for $SO(3)$. (The proof use some facts derived from theorem 1.)

4. Reduction of the Hamiltonian system

The purpose of this section is to study the symmetries of the Hamiltonian system $(G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*, \Omega, H)$ described in the previous section and use that to reduce the corresponding dynamics, eliminating degrees of freedom in the system. The idea is to apply the symplectic point reduction theorem (see [23] for the original references and [28] for full details in this subject) and carry out the appropriate interpretation of the reduced Hamiltonian system for the study of important questions as the integrability of the system. Namely, we shall focus our attention on the integrals of motion of the reduced Hamiltonian system.

4.1. Symplectic point reduced space

Let ϕ be the smooth left action of the Lie group G on $G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ defined by

$$\phi(g, (x, Y, \mu, \xi)) = (gx, Y, \mu, \xi), \quad (21)$$

for each $g \in G$ and $(x, Y, \mu, \xi) \in G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*$. The moment map of ϕ is the map $J : G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^* \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ defined, for each $(x, Y, \mu, \xi) \in G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*$, by

$$J(x, Y, \mu, \xi) = \text{Ad}_{x^{-1}}^*(\mu - \text{ad}_Y^* \xi). \quad (22)$$

The action ϕ can be seen as the left trivialization to $G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ of the cotangent lift of the action of G on $G \times \mathfrak{g}$ given, for each $g \in G$ and $(x, Y) \in G \times \mathfrak{g}$, by $(g, (x, Y)) \mapsto L_{(g,0)}(x, Y) = (gx, Y)$. Recall that every cotangent lift action is symplectic and has momentum map Ad^* -equivariant (see [1], p 283). So, it is easy to verify the following statement:

(A) ϕ is a symplectic action with momentum map Ad^* -equivariant.

Observe now that the action ϕ is proper since it is an action of a compact Lie group. Moreover, ϕ is obviously free and hence the symmetry algebra of every point in $G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ is zero, which is equivalent to saying that every $\eta \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ is a regular value of the momentum map J .

Let $\eta \in \mathfrak{g}^*$. Consider the coadjoint isotropy subgroup of η , defined by

$$G_\eta := \{g \in G : \text{Ad}_{g^{-1}}^* \eta = \eta\} \quad (23)$$

and also the level set $J^{-1}(\eta)$ of the momentum map J . Note that

$$J^{-1}(\eta) = \{(x, Y, \mu, \xi) \in G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^* : \mu = \text{Ad}_x^* \eta + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi\}. \quad (24)$$

Because ϕ is a symplectic G -action on the symplectic manifold $G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ and $\eta \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ is a regular value of J , we see that $J^{-1}(\eta)$ is a submanifold of $G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*$.

Furthermore, as a consequence of J being Ad^* -equivariant, we easily prove that $J^{-1}(\eta)$ is G_η -invariant. The comments now exposed allow us to conclude that G_η acts on $J^{-1}(\eta)$ and that the orbit space

$$(G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*)_\eta := J^{-1}(\eta)/G_\eta \quad (25)$$

is well defined. The action of G_η on $J^{-1}(\eta)$ is obtained by restriction of ϕ to the subgroup (23) and to the G_η -invariant submanifold (24). It turns out that the action ϕ is proper and free and that by definition G_η is a closed subgroup of G , thus (see [28], p 60):

(B) The action of G_η on $J^{-1}(\eta)$ is proper and free.

This result guarantees that the orbit space (25) is a smooth manifold and that the corresponding projection map is a surjective submersion.

Since the conditions **(A)** and **(B)** are satisfied, we are able to apply the symplectic point reduction theorem. The theorem states the following result:

The reduced space $(G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*)_\eta$ has a unique symplectic structure Ω_η characterized by the identity $\pi_\eta^* \Omega_\eta = i_\eta^* \Omega$, where i_η is the canonical inclusion from $J^{-1}(\eta)$ to $G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ and π_η is the projection of $J^{-1}(\eta)$ onto $(G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*)_\eta$.

The symplectic manifold $\left((G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*)_\eta, \Omega_\eta\right)$ is called the *symplectic point reduced space* at η .

Let us now explore in more detail the reduction obtained. More specifically, we will interpret the symplectic point reduced space in a strategic way to conduct further studies. In what follows, we shall adopt the notation ϕ for the above G_η -action on $J^{-1}(\eta)$. First, we notice that from (24), the submanifold $J^{-1}(\eta)$ is diffeomorphic to the semidirect product $G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ (of the Lie group $G \times \mathfrak{g}$ and the vectorial space $\mathfrak{g}^*$) through the diffeomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_\eta : G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* &\longrightarrow J^{-1}(\eta) \\ (x, Y, \xi) &\longmapsto (x, Y, \text{Ad}_x^* \eta + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi, \xi). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Consider the G_η -action on $G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ given, for each $g \in G_\eta$ and $(x, Y, \xi) \in G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$, by $g \cdot (x, Y, \xi) = (gx, Y, \xi)$ and consider also the corresponding orbit space $G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*/G_\eta$.

Lemma 3 *The diffeomorphism (26) induces a new diffeomorphism*

$$\bar{\Upsilon}_\eta : (G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*)/G_\eta \longrightarrow (G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*)_\eta, \quad (27)$$

which maps the G_η -orbit of the element $(x, Y, \xi) \in G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ into the G_η -orbit of the element $(x, Y, \text{Ad}_x^* \eta + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi, \xi) \in J^{-1}(\eta)$.

PROOF. We have just to prove that Υ_η is equivariant for the G_η -action ϕ on $J^{-1}(\eta)$ and the G_η -action on $G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ described above. Indeed, if $g \in G_\eta$ and $(x, Y, \xi) \in G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$, then $\Upsilon_\eta(g \cdot (x, Y, \xi)) = (gx, Y, \text{Ad}_{gx}^* \eta + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi, \xi) = (gx, Y, \text{Ad}_x^*(\text{Ad}_g^* \eta) + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi, \xi) = (gx, Y, \text{Ad}_x^* \eta + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi, \xi) = \phi_g(\Upsilon_\eta(x, Y, \xi))$. $\square$

Proposition 3 *The point reduced space $(G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*)_\eta$ is diffeomorphic to the space $\mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$, where $\mathcal{O}_\eta$ denotes the coadjoint orbit of the element η .*

PROOF. It is clear that the map $\varepsilon_\eta : (G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*) / G_\eta \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$, which takes a G_η -orbit of an element $(x, Y, \xi) \in G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ to a current point $(\text{Ad}_x^* \eta, Y, \xi) \in \mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$, is a diffeomorphism. Hence, one constructs the map $\bar{\varphi}_\eta := \varepsilon_\eta \circ \tilde{\Upsilon}_\eta^{-1}$, that is

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\varphi}_\eta : (G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*)_\eta &\longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \\ [(x, Y, \text{Ad}_x^* \eta + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi, \xi)]_\eta &\longmapsto (\text{Ad}_x^* \eta, Y, \xi), \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

which gives us the diffeomorphism. $\square$

The result from the previous proposition allows us to conclude now that $\bar{\varphi}_\eta$ is a symplectomorphism, being $\bar{\Omega}_\eta = (\bar{\varphi}_\eta^{-1})^* \Omega_\eta$ the symplectic structure on $\mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$.

To finish, it is useful to notice that the map $\varphi_\eta := \bar{\varphi}_\eta \circ \pi_\eta : J^{-1}(\eta) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ is such that

$$\varphi_\eta(x, Y, \text{Ad}_x^* \eta + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi, \xi) = (\text{Ad}_x^* \eta, Y, \xi). \quad (29)$$

Furthermore, φ_η is surjective since $\bar{\varphi}_\eta$ is bijective and the projection π_η is surjective.

Besides the reduction of the phase space, the symplectic point reduction theorem has a dynamic counterpart, which will be addressed in the next subsection.

4.2. Reduction of the dynamics

We proceed with the analysis of the reduction of the dynamics of the Hamiltonian system of cubic polynomials $(G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*, \Omega, H)$ described in subsection 3.3. We first present the natural reduction of dynamics that comes from the symplectic point reduction theorem. Then we shall perform this reduction as a dynamics on a Hamiltonian system on $(\mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*, \bar{\Omega}_\eta)$ in the context of the previous subsection, that is, using the diffeomorphism (28).

Consider the Hamiltonian H given by (17) and the associated Hamiltonian vector field X_H defined by (18). Notice that H is invariant under the G -action defined by (21). The symplectic point reduction theorem allows us to conclude the following:

The flow f_t of the Hamiltonian vector field X_H induces a flow f_t^η on the reduced space $(G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*)_\eta$ defined by $\pi_\eta \circ f_t \circ i_\eta = f_t^\eta \circ \pi_\eta$. The vector field generated by the flow f_t^η is Hamiltonian with associated reduced Hamiltonian function H_η defined uniquely by $H_\eta \circ \pi_\eta = H \circ i_\eta$. Furthermore, the vector fields X_H and X_{H_η} are π_η -related.

The triple $((G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*)_\eta, \Omega_\eta, H_\eta)$ is called the *reduced Hamiltonian system*. We are interested now in characterizing the corresponding system on $(\mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*, \bar{\Omega}_\eta)$. Namely, we shall determine the expression of the reduced Hamiltonian vector field when interpreted as a vector field on $\mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ regarding the description given at the end of the previous subsection. To effect this, one follows the steps below.

From now on, wherever there is no confusion, we will denote an element $\text{Ad}_x^* \eta \in \mathcal{O}_\eta$ by θ , $\theta := \text{Ad}_x^* \eta$. Introduce the Hamiltonian function $h := H_\eta \circ \bar{\varphi}_\eta^{-1} : \mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, with $\bar{\varphi}_\eta$ defined by (28).

Lemma 4 *For each $(\theta, Y, \xi) \in \mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$, we have*

$$h(\theta, Y, \xi) = \theta(Y) + \frac{1}{2} \xi(X_\xi). \quad (30)$$

PROOF. Since the function φ defined by (29) is surjective, we know that the element $(x, Y, \theta + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi, \xi) \in J^{-1}(\eta)$ is such that $\varphi_\eta(x, Y, \theta + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi, \xi) = (\theta, Y, \xi)$. Thus, $h(\theta, Y, \xi) = (H_\eta \circ \pi_\eta)(x, Y, \theta + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi, \xi)$. But from the definition of H_η , we have $H_\eta \circ \pi_\eta = H \circ i_\eta$, so use (17) and the result follows. $\square$

Since $\bar{\varphi}_\eta$ is a symplectomorphism, we see that the Hamiltonian vector field X_h associated to h is such that $X_h \circ \bar{\varphi}_\eta = T\bar{\varphi}_\eta \circ X_{H_\eta}$. Then, $X_h \circ \bar{\varphi}_\eta \circ \pi_\eta = T\bar{\varphi}_\eta \circ X_{H_\eta} \circ \pi_\eta$, that is, $X_h \circ \varphi_\eta = T\bar{\varphi}_\eta \circ X_{H_\eta} \circ \pi_\eta$, where φ_η is the function defined by (29). Now, use the fact that X_H and X_{H_η} are π_η -related, that is, $T\pi_\eta \circ X_H \circ i_\eta = X_{H_\eta} \circ \pi_\eta$, to obtain

$$X_h \circ \varphi_\eta = T\varphi_\eta \circ X_H \circ i_\eta. \quad (31)$$

We shall develop the expression of X_h for each point in $\mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$, using the relation now obtained and after we present a useful remark.

Lemma 5 *If $(a, b, c, d) \in T_{(x, Y, \theta + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi, \xi)} J^{-1}(\eta)$, then*

$$T_{(x, Y, \theta + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi, \xi)} \varphi_\eta(a, b, c, d) = \left(\text{ad}_{T_x L_{x^{-1}a}}^* \theta, b, d \right). \quad (32)$$

PROOF. First we would like to clarify that the choice of the element (a, b, c, d) is related to the fact that $T_{(x, Y, \theta + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi, \xi)} J^{-1}(\eta)$ be a subset of $T_{(x, Y, \theta + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi, \xi)}(G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*) = T_x G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^*$. Now, let $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \text{Ad}_{\beta_1}^* \eta + \text{ad}_{\beta_2}^* \beta_3, \beta_3)$ be a curve in $J^{-1}(\eta)$ satisfying the initial conditions $\beta(0) = (x, Y, \theta + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi, \xi)$ and $\dot{\beta}(0) = (a, b, c, d)$. Then, we know that $T_{(x, Y, \theta + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi, \xi)} \varphi_\eta(a, b, c, d) = d(\varphi_\eta \circ \beta)(0)/dt$, which is equal to $(\text{ad}_{T_{\beta_1(0)} L_{\beta_1(0)^{-1} \dot{\beta}_1(0)}}^* \text{Ad}_{\beta_1(0)}^* \eta, \dot{\beta}_2(0), \dot{\beta}_3(0))$, that is, $(\text{ad}_{T_x L_{x^{-1}a}}^* \theta, b, d)$ as we wanted to prove. $\square$

We are now able to prove the following result.

Proposition 4 *For each point $(\theta, Y, \xi) \in \mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$, the dynamical vector field X_h of the Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*, \bar{\Omega}_\eta, h)$ is given by*

$$X_h(\theta, Y, \xi) = (\text{ad}_Y^* \theta, X_\xi, -\theta). \quad (33)$$

PROOF. We begin by noticing that due to the relations (29) and (31), we get $X_h(\theta, Y, \xi) = (T\varphi_\eta \circ X_H)(x, Y, \theta + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi, \xi)$. Now according (18) we have $X_H(x, Y, \theta + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi, \xi) = (T_e L_x Y, X_\xi, 0, -\theta)$. It remains only to show that $T_{(x, Y, \theta + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi, \xi)} \varphi_\eta(T_e L_x Y, X_\xi, 0, -\theta) = (\text{ad}_Y^* \theta, X_\xi, -\theta)$, but this follows from (32) taking $(a, b, c, d) = (T_e L_x Y, X_\xi, 0, -\theta)$. $\square$

Thus, the equations of Hamilton on the reduced manifold $\mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ are given by

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\theta} = \text{ad}_Y^* \theta \\ \dot{Y} = X_\xi \\ \dot{\xi} = -\theta. \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

Remark 2 In remark 1, we have proved the equivalence between the solutions of the equations of Hamilton (19) and the Euler-Lagrange equations (20). It is obvious that the reduced dynamics described by (33) is also related with the variational approach of cubic polynomials. In fact, an integral curve of the reduced Hamiltonian vector field (33) give rise to a curve that satisfies the second equation of the Euler-Lagrange system (20). Indeed, writing the first equation of (34) as an equation on the Lie algebra (see the end of subsection 2.1 for details on notation), we get $\dot{X}_\theta + [Y, X_\theta] = 0$. But, by the other two equations of (34), we know that $X_\theta = -\ddot{Y}$. We conclude that a solution of the reduced system gives a solution of

$$\ddot{Y} + [Y, \ddot{Y}] = 0. \quad (35)$$

4.3. Invariants along the extremal trajectories

Integrals of motion of a dynamical system are quantities that are conserved along the flow of that system and can be sometimes associated to symmetries of the system. A classical result due to Liouville says that a dynamical system on a phase space of dimension $2N$ is completely integrable if it admits N (almost everywhere) functionally independent first integrals in involution (i.e., their Poisson brackets all vanish). However, these situations are rather rare. In practice, one often deals with Hamiltonian systems which admits a non-abelian group of symmetries or an abelian group of symmetries in number less than the required to have complete integrability. If some special conditions are satisfied, the non-abelian set of independent integrals can lead us to the integrability of the system (theorem of Mishchenko-Fomenko). But, in most cases one naturally expects to find only a number of independent Poisson commuting invariants less than N , which will allow us to partially reduce the original system.

The problem we are concerned with in this subsection is the preliminar analysis of the symmetries of the Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*, \bar{\Omega}_\eta, h)$, so that we can study the integrability of the system in a forthcoming work. We shall find, by using the classical Lie-Cartan theorem, a maximum number of functionally independent first integrals in involution. In the rest of this paper, for the sake of simplicity, we shall use the following notation:

$$\dim \mathfrak{g} = n \quad \text{and} \quad \dim \mathcal{O}_\eta = 2m \quad (36)$$

(recall that the dimension of the coadjoint orbit is always even), where obviously $2m \leq n$. So, the dimension of the phase space of our Hamiltonian system shall be

$$\dim(\mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*) = 2(n + m). \quad (37)$$

A function $f : \mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an integral of motion of our dynamical system (with associated vector field X_h) if $[X_h(w)](f) = 0$, that is, $[(df)(w)](X_h(w)) = 0$, for all $w \in \mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$. It is important to notice that $df : \mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \rightarrow T^*(\mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*)$ is such that $df(w) \in T_w^* \mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g} \subseteq \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}$. In that sense, we shall assume the notation $df(w) = (\partial f(w)/\partial \theta, \partial f(w)/\partial Y, \partial f(w)/\partial \xi)$.

The Hamiltonian function is naturally an integral of motion of the Hamiltonian system. So, the function (30), that is,

$$l_1 \equiv h = \theta(Y) + \frac{1}{2} \xi(X_\xi)$$

is an integral of motion. But besides that, we are able to prove the following result:

Proposition 5 *The functions $l_{i+1} : \mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by*

$$l_{i+1} = (\theta + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi)(A_i), \text{ with } A_i \text{ a fixed basis element of } \mathfrak{g}, \quad (38)$$

are integrals of motion of the Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*, \bar{\Omega}_\eta, h)$.

PROOF. Consider $w = (\theta, Y, \xi) \in \mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \subseteq \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$, with $\theta = \text{Ad}_x^* \eta$, for some $x \in G$. An elementary computation gives

$$dl_{i+1}(w) = (A_i, -\text{ad}_{A_i}^* \xi, \text{ad}_Y A_i). \quad (39)$$

Then, by (33), we get $[X_h(l_{i+1})](w) = \theta(\text{ad}_Y A_i) - \xi(\text{ad}_{A_i} X_\xi) - \theta(\text{ad}_Y A_i) = \langle [X_\xi, X_\xi], A_i \rangle = 0$, which shows that $[(dl_{i+1})(w)](X_h(w)) = 0$, for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, proving that the given functions are invariant. $\square$

Remark 3 *Recall that in the context of the variational approach two invariants are known, (2) and (3). These invariants are related with the invariants now obtained. Indeed, it is simple to prove (using theorem 1) that $l_1 \equiv I_1$ and $2I_2 - \sum_{i=1}^n l_{i+1}^2 \equiv \theta(X_\theta)$.*

It is immediate to see that any linear combination of the $n + 1$ integrals of motion described above is also an integral of motion of the system. A natural question arises: to extract, from the set of invariant functions, a maximal set of independent commuting invariant functions. In order to answer to this problem, we begin with some comments:

- The independence between the invariants l_{i+1} , $i = 1, \dots, n$, defined by (38) is obvious, but these invariants are not in general in involution with each other.
- On the other hand, it is clear that l_1 commutes with each one of these functions l_{i+1} , since l_1 coincides with the Hamiltonian function.

Furthermore, we have the following two results:

Lemma 6 *Consider the invariants l_{i+1} , for $i = 1, \dots, n$, defined by (38). The Hamiltonian l_1 is functionally independent of all the invariants l_{i+1} .*

PROOF. Consider the coordinate expression for the invariants, with respect to the natural basis taken from the orthonormal basis $\{A_i\}_{i=1,\dots,n}$ of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$:

$$\begin{aligned} l_1 &= \sum_{j=1}^m \theta_j y^j + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n (\xi_j)^2 \\ l_2 &= \theta_1 + \sum_{j,k=1}^n C_{j1}^k y_j \xi_k \\ &\vdots \\ l_{n+1} &= \theta_n + \sum_{j,k=1}^n C_{jn}^k y_j \xi_k. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that for $i > m$, θ_i is a function of $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m$. We shall prove that $dl_1 \wedge dl_{i+1} \neq 0$, for a dense domain of $\mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$). But it is immediate to isolate the coefficients corresponding to $dy^j \wedge d\theta_j$, which are equal to $\theta_j dy^j \wedge d\theta_j$. Thus, the condition of the wedge product being equal to zero implies that $\theta_j = 0, \forall j$, which is impossible for any regular value of η different from zero.

If $\eta = 0$ it is immediate to check that the invariants are also independent, since in this situation the Hamiltonian does not depend on Y while the other invariants do. $\square$

Lemma 7 *Considering the Poisson structure on $\mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$, the set $\{l_{i+1}\}_{i=1,\dots,n}$ is endowed with a Lie algebra structure that makes it isomorphic to the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$.*

PROOF. Consider the orthonormal basis $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ and represent by C_{ji}^k the structure constants of this Lie algebra for this basis. If $w = (\theta, Y, \xi) \in \mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$, we know that $\{l_{i+1}, l_{j+1}\}(w) = [dl_{i+1}(w)](X_{l_{j+1}}(w))$, with $X_{l_{j+1}}$ denoting the Hamiltonian vector field associated to l_{j+1} .

In order to proceed with the proof, let us find now the expression of the Hamiltonian vector field $X_{l_{j+1}}$ of l_{j+1} in a similar way to the one used in proposition 4 for X_h . To do this, first consider the function $L_{j+1} : G \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathfrak{g}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ uniquely characterized by the identity $L_{j+1} \circ i_\eta = l_{j+1} \circ \varphi_\eta$, where φ_η is the surjective function defined by (29). More precisely, we have $L_{j+1}(z) = l_{j+1}(\theta, Y, \xi)|_{\theta=\mu-\text{ad}_Y^* \xi} = \mu(A_j)$ where the element z is such that $w = \varphi_\eta(z)$, that is, $z = (x, Y, \theta + \text{ad}_Y^* \xi, \xi) \in J^{-1}(\eta)$. Then, the Hamiltonian vector field $X_{L_{j+1}}$ associated to the function L_{j+1} is related with $X_{l_{j+1}}$ as follows

$$X_{l_{j+1}}(w) = T_z \varphi_\eta(X_{L_{j+1}}(z)) = \left(\text{ad}_{T_x L_{x-1} X_{L_{j+1}}^1}^* \theta, X_{L_{j+1}}^2, X_{L_{j+1}}^4 \right),$$

where we use lemma 5 choosing $(a, b, c, d) = X_{L_{j+1}}(z) = (X_{L_{j+1}}^1, X_{L_{j+1}}^2, X_{L_{j+1}}^3, X_{L_{j+1}}^4)$. In order to completely determine $X_{l_{j+1}}(w)$, we must to find the expression of the components $X_{L_{j+1}}^1$, $X_{L_{j+1}}^2$ and $X_{L_{j+1}}^4$. A computation analogous to the one done for the components of the vector field X_H in proposition 2 shows that $X_{L_{j+1}}^1 = T_e L_x A_j$, $X_{L_{j+1}}^2 = \text{ad}_Y A_j$ and $X_{L_{j+1}}^4 = \text{ad}_{A_j}^* \xi$, and hence

$$X_{l_{j+1}}(w) = \left(\text{ad}_{A_j}^* \theta, \text{ad}_Y A_j, \text{ad}_{A_j}^* \xi \right). \quad (40)$$

Now, recalling the expression (39) of $dl_{i+1}(w)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \{l_{i+1}, l_{j+1}\}(w) &= \theta([A_j, A_i]) + \xi([A_i, [A_j, Y]] + [A_j, [Y, A_i]]) = \\ &= \theta([A_j, A_i]) - \xi([Y, [A_i, A_j]]) = (\theta + ad_Y^* \xi)([A_j, A_i]) = \\ &= \sum_{i,j,k=1}^n C_{ji}^k l_{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

The structure constants of the Lie algebra generated by the functions l_{i+1} , $i = 1, \dots, n$ and the structure constants of $\mathfrak{g}$ coincide, so the algebras are isomorphic. $\square$

Let us summarize the situation:

- We have $n + 1$ smooth independent functions, the integrals of motion $l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{n+1}$, whose differentials are linearly independent on $\mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ (see lemma 6).
- The linear span of these functions is closed with respect to the Poisson bracket (see lemma 7 and recall that l_1 is in involution with all the other functions).

Thus, the linear span $\mathfrak{L}$ of these $n + 1$ functions has a structure of a finite-dimensional real Lie algebra, with $\dim \mathfrak{L} = n + 1$. This algebra is called the algebra of integrals.

Finally, we shall use the S. Lie - E. Cartan (see [6]):

Theorem 2 (S. Lie - E. Cartan) *Consider a Hamiltonian system (M, ω, H) with first integrals $F_1, \dots, F_k$ such that $\{F_i, F_j\} = a_{ij}(F_1, \dots, F_k)$. Let $F : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ be the natural mapping generated by these set of integrals.*

Suppose that the point $c \in \mathbb{R}^k$ is not a critical value of the mapping F and that in its neighborhood the rank of matrix (a_{ij}) is constant. Then in a small neighborhood $U \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ of c one can find k independent functions $\varphi_j : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that the functions $\phi_j = \varphi_j \circ F : N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $N = F^{-1}(U)$, satisfy the relations

$$\{\phi_1, \phi_2\} = \dots = \{\phi_{2q-1}, \phi_{2q}\} = 1,$$

whereas the remaining brackets $\{\phi_i, \phi_j\}$ vanish. The number $2q$ equals the rank of the matrix $[a_{ij}]$.

We are interested in the following consequence of the above theorem (see [6]):

Remark 4 *Under the hypotheses of Lie-Cartan theorem and using the notation above, there are $k - q$ independent integrals in involution: $\phi_2, \phi_4, \dots, \phi_{2q-2}, \phi_{2q}, \phi_{2q+1}, \dots, \phi_k$. As a consequence, the original Hamiltonian system can be reduced, by the method of Poincaré, to a system with minus $k - q$ degrees of freedom than the original one.*

We consider now an open dense subset D in $\mathcal{O}_\eta \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*$ where the functional independence of the $n + 1$ integrals is satisfied and where the skew-symmetric Poisson bracket matrix $(\{l_i, l_j\})$, $1 \leq i, j \leq n + 1$, has maximal rank. Notice that, by lemma 7, the maximum rank of this Poisson bracket matrix coincides with the maximum rank of the matrix $M_{\mathfrak{g}}(a) = (M_{ij}(a))$, with $M_{ij}(a) = \sum_{k=1}^n C_{ij}^k a_k$, for $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and

where C_{ij}^k are structure constants of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. We fix the notation (note that this rank is always even):

$$r_{\mathfrak{g}} := \frac{1}{2} \max_{a \in \mathbb{R}^n} \text{rank} M_{\mathfrak{g}}(a). \quad (41)$$

In consideration of remark 4, the $2(m+n)$ -dimensional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{O}_{\eta} \times \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}^*, \bar{\Omega}_{\eta}, h)$ admits $n+1-r_{\mathfrak{g}}$ functions defined on an open subset of D , which form a set of independent integrals of the motion in involution. Thus, we can expect the system to be reduced to a system of dimension equal to $2(m+r_{\mathfrak{g}}-1)$.

Example 1 Consider the problem of cubic polynomials on the Lie group $SO(3)$, which can be illustrated by the dynamic optimal control problem of the spherical free rigid body study by the authors of this paper in [5]. In this case, it is well known that the coadjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_{\eta}$ corresponds to a 2-dimensional sphere with radius $\|\eta\|$. (For the singular case $\eta = 0$ the orbit reduces to one point.) So, considering the non-singular case, the symplectic reduced manifold $\mathcal{O}_{\eta} \times \mathfrak{so}(3) \times \mathfrak{so}^*(3)$ has dimension equal to 8 and $r_{\mathfrak{g}} = 1$. Applying the above theorem, the corresponding reduced Hamiltonian system has 3 independent invariants in involution and it can be reduced to a 2-dimensional system.

As mentioned at the beginning of this section, these results on integrals of the motion may have important implications from the point of view of the integrability of the corresponding dynamical systems. Thus, they are relevant at the level of determining the cubic polynomials. In conclusion, by using the Lie-Cartan theorem, we are able to reduce the Hamiltonian system to a system with at least, $n+1-r_{\mathfrak{g}}$ degrees of freedom less. We note that if $m+r_{\mathfrak{g}} = 1$, the system will be completely integrable. But, this condition happens only in trivial cases, when the algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is abelian or the coadjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_{\eta}$ is reduced to a point.

We hope to address this integrability subject with detail in a future paper.

References

- [1] Abraham R and Marsden J E 1978 *Foundations of Mechanics* (2nd edition, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.)
- [2] Abrunheiro L and Camarinha M 2005 *Cubic polynomials on $SO(3)$* July 2003 Proc. EQUADIFF Int. Conference on Differential Equations (Hasselt, Belgium) ed F Dumortier *et al* (Singapore: World Scientific) pp 1036-1038
- [3] Abrunheiro L and Camarinha M 2005 Riemannian cubic polynomials *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino, Control Theory and Stabil.*, I **63** (4) 297–303
- [4] Abrunheiro L, Camarinha M and Clemente-Gallardo J 2007 *Geometry of a second order optimal control problem. Riemannian cubic polynomials* September 2006 Proc. XV Int. Workshop on Geometry and Physics (Tenerife, Canary Islands, Spain) vol 11 ed D Iglesias Ponte *et al* (RSME) pp 199-204
- [5] Abrunheiro L, Camarinha M and Clemente-Gallardo J (accepted) *Minimum force optimal control of the spherical free rigid body* September 2010 Proc. Control'2010 9th Portuguese Conference on Automatic Control (Coimbra, Portugal)
- [6] Arnold V I, Kozlov V V and Neishtadt A I 1988 *Mathematical Aspects of Classical and Celestial Mechanics Dynamical Systems III (Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences vol 3)* ed V I Arnold (Springer-Verlag)

- [7] Barbero-Liñán M, Echeverría-Enríquez A, Martín de Diego D, Muñoz-Lecanda M C and Román-Roy N 2007 Skinner-Rusk unified formalism for optimal control systems and applications *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **40** 12071–12093
- [8] Bates L M and Cushman R H 1997 *Global Aspects of Classical Integrable Systems* (Basel, Boston, Berlin: Birkhäuser Verlag)
- [9] Benedito R and Martín de Diego D 2005 *Hidden symplecticity in Hamilton's principle algorithms* August–September 2004 Differential Geometry and Its Applications Proc. 9th Int Conf (Prague, Czech Republic) pp 411–419
- [10] Bloch A M 2003 *Nonholonomic Mechanics and Control* (New York: Springer)
- [11] Bloch A M and Crouch P 1996 *On the equivalence of higher order variational problems and optimal control problems* December 1996 Proc. 35th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (Kobe, Japan) vol 2 pp 1648–1653
- [12] Camarinha M, Crouch P and Silva Leite F 1995 Splines of class C^k on non-euclidean spaces *IMA Journal of Mathematics Control & Information* **12** 399–410
- [13] Camarinha M, Crouch P and Silva Leite F 2000 *Hamiltonian structure of generalized cubic polynomials* March 2000 Proc. IFAC Workshop on Lagrangian and Hamiltonian Methods for Nonlinear Control (Princeton University, USA) pp 13–18
- [14] Camarinha M, Crouch P and Silva Leite F 2001 On the geometry of Riemannian cubic polynomials *Differential Geometry and its Applications* **15** 107–135
- [15] Crouch P and Silva Leite F 1995 The dynamic interpolation problem: on Riemannian manifolds, Lie groups and symmetric spaces *J. Dynam. Control Systems* **1** (2) 177–202
- [16] Delgado-Téllez M and Ibort A 2003 A Panorama of Geometrical Optimal Control Theory *Extracta Math.* **18** (2) 129–151
- [17] Giambò R, Giannoni F and Piccione P 2002 An analytical theory for Riemannian cubic polynomials *IMA Journal of Mathematics Control & Information* **19** 445–460
- [18] Gotay M J and Nester J M 1979 Presymplectic Lagrangian systems. I: the constraint algorithm and the equivalence theorem *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Section A* **30** (2) 129–142
- [19] Gotay M J and Nester J M 1980 Presymplectic Lagrangian systems. II: the second-order equation problem *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Section A* **32** (1) 1–13
- [20] Holm D D, Marsden J E and Ratiu T S 1986 The Hamiltonian structure of continuum mechanics in material, inverse material, spatial and convective representations *Séminaire de Mathématiques supérieures, Les Presses de L'Univ. de Montréal* **100** 11–122
- [21] Kolář I, Michor P W and Slovák J 1993 *Natural Operations in Differential Geometry* (Berlin, Heidelberg, New York: Springer Verlag)
- [22] León M de, Cortés J, Martín de Diego D and Martínez S 2004 General Symmetries in Optimal Control *Rep. Math. Phys.* **53** (1) 55–78
- [23] Marsden J E and Weinstein A 1974 Reduction of symplectic manifolds with symmetry *Rep. Math. Phys.* **5** (1) 121–130
- [24] Milnor J 1969 *Morse Theory* (Princeton, New Jersey, USA: Princeton University Press)
- [25] Noakes L, Heinzinger G and Paden B 1989 Cubic splines on curved spaces *IMA J. Math. Control Inform.* **6** 465–473
- [26] Noakes L 2003 Null Cubics and Lie Quadratics *J. Math. Phys.* (3) **44** 1436–1448
- [27] Noakes L 2006 Duality and Riemannian cubics *Adv. Comput. Math.* **25** 195–209
- [28] Ortega J P and Ratiu T S 2004 *Momentum Maps and Hamiltonian Reduction* (Progress in Mathematics, Vol. 222) ed H Bass *et al* (Boston: Birkhuser).
- [29] Popiel T 2007 Higher order geodesics in Lie groups *Math. Control Signals Systems* **19** 235–253
- [30] Silva Leite F, Camarinha M and Crouch P 2000 Elastic Curves as Solutions of Riemannian and Sub-Riemannian Control Problems *Math. Control Signals Systems* **13** 140–155